DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 693 EC 122 856

AUTHOR Mason, Jessie B.
TITLE Development and Implementation of a Special Education Training Institute for Classroom Teachers.
INSTITUTION Nova Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
PUB DATE Dec 78
NOTE 105p.: Introductory Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Doctoral Theses: Educational Accountability; Elementary Education: *Handicapped Children; Identification: *Inservice Teacher Education; *Mainstreaming; *Program Descriptions; *Student Evaluation: *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland (Prince Georges County)

ABSTRACT

The report describes the development and implementation of a Prince Georges County (Maryland) special education training institute designed to increase elementary school regular classroom teachers' knowledge and skills relating to teaching mildly handicapped children. The training institute was organized into four modules: identification of students with special needs, special education programs and services, techniques of classroom management, and evaluation and accountability for students with special needs. The modules were divided into components, within which teachers were expected to achieve specific competencies. Twenty professionals from the fields of special and regular education served as consultants for the 15 sessions of the training institute, which was accepted by the Maryland State Department of Education. As a result of the institute, the 18 handicapped children in the program, all of whom had previously attended regular classrooms minimally in favor of self contained classrooms and resource rooms, were assigned to regular classrooms for longer periods of time and their teachers were more receptive to their being mainstreamed. Reception of the training model led to its adoption elsewhere in the county. (Author/DLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181693

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JAN 19 1979

EC

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Jessie B. Mason

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne Tolby

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

December 1978

EC122856

EC 122856

AUTHOR Mason, Jessie B.

TITLE Development and Implementation of a Special Education Training Institute for Classroom Teachers

DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Classroom Management; Classroom Observation; Classroom Teachers; Consultants; Educable Mentally Retarded; Educational Objectives; Elementary School; Emotionally Disturbed; Evaluation; Child Identification; Individualized Instruction; Inservice Education; Learning Characteristics; Learning Disabilities; Mainstreaming; Regular Class Placement; Regular Education; Special Education Programs; Staff Development; Students; Special Education Teachers

ABSTRACT A special education training insttitute was developed and implemented in a suburban school district, in Prince George's County, Maryland, for the purpose of increasing regular classroom teachers' knowledge and skills relating to teaching mildly handicapped children in regular elementary classrooms. The training institute was designed for teachers in one elementary school who expressed concern about their feelings of inability to plan and implement appropriate instruction for handicapped students who were, administratively, assigned to their classrooms. These teachers participated voluntarily in the training institute.

The training institute was organized into four modules: Module I--Identification of Students with Special Needs; Module II--Special Education Programs and Services; Module III--Techniques of Classroom Management; and Module IV--Evaluation and Accountability for Students with Special Needs. The modules were divided into components and teachers were expected to achieve specific competencies within each component. Twenty professionals, from the fields of special and regular education, served as consultants for the fifteen sessions of the training institute. The plan for the training institute was accepted by the Maryland State Department of Education, which enabled participants to gain three hours of course credit toward renewal of teaching certificates and/or salary increase.

Prior to the training institute, the 18 handicapped students discussed in this practicum had been placed in self-contained special education classes. As a precipitating factor, more recently these students had been moved from self-contained classes to special education resource room services and had attended regular classrooms minimally. At the conclusion of the training institute, these students were assigned to regular classrooms for longer periods of time and teachers were more receptive toward mainstreaming of these students.

Reception of the training model has led to its adoption elsewhere in the County.

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

by Jessie B. Mason[1]

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the National Ed.D. Program
for Educational Leaders, Nova University

Introductory Practicum
Washington II Cluster
Submitted: December 1978

[1]Supervisor of Special Education
Prince George's County
Maryland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	Background Information and Needs Assessment	1
	Description of the School	1
	Definition of the Problem	2
	Needs Assessment	4
II.	Review of Related Literature	11
	Bases for Mainstreaming	12
	Parental Pressure	13
	Theoretical Concepts	14
	Research	17
	Legislation	21
	Practices in Mainstreaming	23
	Training of Teachers for Mainstreaming	25
	Summary	29
III.	Objectives	30
	Objective I	30
	Objective II	30
	Rationale for Objectives I and II	30
	Objective III	31
	Rationale for Objective III	31
IV.	Strategy	33
	Rejected Strategies	33
	Rationale for Strategy Chosen	34
V.	Implementation of the Training Institute	37
	Development	37
	Operation	39

Table of Contents (continued)

Chapter		Page
VI.	Evaluation	44
	Measurement of Results	47
	Objectives I and II	47
	Objective III	53
	Evaluation of the Practicum	55
	Teachers' Evaluation of the Training Institute	55
	Consultants' Evaluation of the Training Institute	58
VII.	Institutionalizing the Results	61
	Further Applications	62
VIII.	Summary	65
Glossary		67
Selected Bibliography		69
Appendixes		
A	Teachers' Interest in a Workshop Concerning Handicapped Children in June 1976	72
B	Teachers' Interest in a Workshop Concerning Handicapped Children in October 1976	73
C	Teacher Survey Form (Pre- and Post-test)	74
D	Survey of Instructional Problems (Pre- and Post-test)	75
E	Training Institute Package (STEP)	76

Table of Contents (continued)

Appendixes		Page
F	Module Assessment Tasks for the STEP Program	92
G	Participant Feedback Form	93
H	Evaluation Form for Consultants	95
I	Plan for Inservice Activity	96
J	News and Views	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Pre-test Responses to Teacher Survey Form (October 1976)	7
2	Pre-test Survey of Teachers' Instructional Problems (October 1976)	9
3	Comparison of Pre-and Post-Test Results on Teacher Survey Form	48
4	Cumulative High-Pass and Low-Pass Scores for the Participants on the Four Module Assessment Tasks	50
5	Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results on Survey of Instructional Problems	52
6	Teachers' Positive Assessment of the Training Institute	56
7	Consultants' Evaluation of the Training Institute	59

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A special education training institute was developed and implemented in an elementary school in Prince George's County, Maryland, to respond to regular classroom teachers' concern about the necessity for mainstreaming handicapped students in that school. (A description of the school and the factors precipitating mainstreaming are given below.) The administrators and faculty of this school sought the assistance of the supervisor of special education (the practicum participant) in planning and implementing ways to effect improved teacher attitudes and more effective educational programs for special education students.

Description of the School

The school, Catherine T. Reed Elementary, is in the Prince Georges' County Public School System in Maryland, which is a suburban area of Washington, D.C. The school is surrounded by single housing and apartment complexes; it is next door to a senior high school and very close to a large governmental agency. The school population is essentially lower-middle class, with a racial mix of about 60 percent white to 40 percent black.

In September of 1976 when preparation for the training institute began, the staff consisted of the principal, vice principal, 20 regular classroom teachers, 2 special education

resource teachers, a reading teacher, a full-time physical education teacher, a music teacher, and a media specialist. There were 540 students enrolled in the school, of which 45 were special education students, with varying degrees of handicapping conditions.[1]

Definition of the Problem

In accordance with State and County mandates, special education students with more severe handicapping conditions are placed in self-contained classrooms with special education teachers. In such instances, the maximum enrollment for the primary class (ages 6 to 9) is 10 students; for the intermediate class (ages 10 to 12), it is 12 students. Students classified as mildly learning disabled, educable mentally retarded, and/or mildly emotionally impaired are assigned to the resource room program, and are mainstreamed in the regular classroom for part of the day. The resource room program is designed for a limit of 30 students for each teacher at any given time; they can be taught by the resource room teacher in an average grouping of 6 children at a time.

In September of 1974, two years prior to inception of the training institute, special education teaching positions at Catherine T. Reed Elementary were decreased from three teachers (two in self-contained special education classrooms and one a resource room teacher) to two special education classroom teachers. The elimination of the resource room position at the school resulted in the unavailability of special education services for some mildly handicapped students who had formerly received

---

[1]See the Glossary for definitions of handicapping conditions. Note that severely handicapped students do not attend regular (comprehensive) schools in Prince George's County, Maryland.

resource services at that school.

During that entire school year, 1974-75, the special education program was operated with only the two self-contained classes for the more severely handicapped children. In the absence of a resource room teacher, the faculty was quite vocal in expressing displeasure about the non-existence of a resource room program in the school. They had relied heavily upon the resource room service as a means of providing additional educational intervention for students with mild learning problems.

In an attempt to respond to the needs of students and the concerns of teaching staff, the principal sought and received approval for converting the special education program from self-contained classes to two resource room programs for the ensuing school year, 1975-76. This change resulted in integrating all special education students into regular classes, without a training program to prepare regular teachers to receive the more severely handicapped children, who attended regular classes only one period a day.

In April of 1976, the principal, as a result of the mounting concerns of the teachers, requested that the practicum participant (who is supervisor of special education in the administrative area in which the school is located) meet with the faculty to discuss the concerns of regular education teachers relative to the integration of special education students in regular classes.

At this point, it should be noted that of the 45 special education students in the school, 18 had handicapping conditions which were sufficiently severe to have warranted their placement in self-contained classrooms in the previous year. The other 27 more mildly handicapped children had been handled in regular classrooms without special education services during this time.

Needs Assessment

On four occasions during school year 1975-76, the supervisor of special education attended the school's monthly Building Team Conference meetings to discuss with school personnel those students who were experiencing or presenting difficulties within the school setting. The practicum participant also visited the individual classrooms of regular teachers to observe the learning and/or social behaviors of certain students in order to make recommendations for instructional intervention.

In addition, in May and June of 1976, meetings were held with the total faculty to discuss their concerns about their inability to plan and implement viable instructional programs in the regular classrooms for the special education students. At the practicum participant's request, the faculty identified their needs as follows:

1. A need for knowledge of teaching and management techniques which could be used effectively with learning disabled children

2. Specification of the academic areas which should be be the responsibility of the classroom teacher

3. Information about the characteristics of children who have specific learning disabilities, emotional impairment, and who are designated as educable mentally retarded

4. An understanding of the varied school records in the cumulative folder of a special student

5. Realistic expectations for children with specific learning disabilities, emotional impairment, and status as educable mentally retarded, and

6. Guidelines for grading, disciplining, and total accountability for the special education students integrated into the mainstream of education

After these needs were identified, five teachers volunteered to serve as members of a task force to assist the practicum participant in the selection of a staff inservice development program to address faculty needs.

In June of 1976, a survey was taken to determine the teachers' interest in attending an inservice activity and their preferences for when it should be scheduled (see Appendix A). The analysis of the survey indicated that:

1. Fifteen regular classroom teachers, one special education resource teacher, and one reading teacher--a total of seventeen teachers--said they planned to attend the mainstreaming workshop

2. Of the time options offered (3-5 p.m. one afternoon per week, 7-9 p.m. one evening per week, or 8-12 noon on Saturdays

semi-monthly, all 17 teachers who indicated that they planned to attend preferred that the inservice activity be scheduled from 3-5 p.m. one afternoon per week.

In October of 1976, to determine continuing interest in a mainstreaming workshop, a second survey was taken to determine the number of teachers who were still planning to attend the training program (see Appendix B). The survey showed that 17 staff members still wanted to participate in the workshop, clearly indicating their feeling of need for such an activity.

In addition, in October of 1976, a Teacher Survey Form adapted from Davis and McCallon (1974) was administered to the teachers (see Appendix C). This form, which elicited the teachers' feelings about their ability to deal with handicapped students in the classroom, was used for two purposes: 1) to determine whether the teachers' needs as stated more informally in meetings in May and June of 1976 would be supported systematically by written data and 2) to serve as a pre-test measure for eventual evaluation of the effectiveness of the inservice training program. The findings are shown in Table 1 on the following page. The form itself provided a 5-point scale ranging from positive to negative on which teachers could rate their feelings about their ability to work with handicapped children. The table shows only neutral and negative responses combined, since in no case did positive responses represent 50 percent of the total. Neutral to negative

Table 1

Pre-test Responses to Teacher Survey Form (October 1976)

N=17

Statement	Percent Neutral or Negative
I am able to prepare an effective educational program for mildly handicapped students	78
I can evaluate children's preferred learning modalities	72
I am able to diagnose handicapped students	53
I can adapt my classroom curriculum to the learning styles of children	53

responses from teachers were considered to indicate inadequacy for effective programming for special education students. The data supported the teachers' more informal statements in May and June of 1976, with over half feeling unable to diagnose handicapped students in educational terms and over half stating that they did not feel capable of adapting their classroom curricula to meet the learning styles of these children. In addition, 78 percent of the teachers felt inadequate to prepare effective educational programs for mildly handicapped students--and at this point 18 more severely handicapped children were also in their classrooms. Only 22 percent of the teachers felt they could perform this function (the teachers involved were two trained special education teachers and one regular education teacher).

To ensure that the inservice training institute would be designed to meet the needs of the teachers receiving the training, a second pre-test for needs assessment was administered in October of 1976. This pre-test was drawn from the N.E.A. Survey of Instructional Problems (1976). (See Appendix D.) The results, shown in Table 2 on the following page, reflected the teachers' responses about their feelings about mainstreaming handicapped students and about inservice education related to teaching special students.

The data in Table 2 are summarized in two major headings, rather than four, as shown in the survey form in Appendix D. Ratings which fell in the serious-to-critical range indicate teachers' concerns stemming from mainstreaming. Responses that fell in the negligible-to-moderate range were deemed to indicate that the respondents did not consider mainstreaming a problem that seriously affected them in their current assignments.

The data depicted in Table 2 show that 41 percent of the teachers felt that it was serious-to-critical that they were not involved in the placement of handicapped students in their classes. Almost half of the teachers felt that regular students were adversely affected to a serious or critical degree by mainstreaming. The most serious instructional problem, indicated by 82 percent of the teachers, was the lack of appropriate instructional materials.

Table 2

Pre-test Survey of Teachers' Instructional Problems (October 1976)

N=17

Statement	Percent Negigible-Moderate	Percent Serious-Critical
Teachers are not consulted before handicapped children are placed in their classes.	59	41
Handicapped children are moved into regular classes without considering their special needs.	65	35
Regular students are adversely affected by mainstreaming.	53	47
Appropriate materials are not provided for teachers and the handicapped children.	18	82
Supporting services, particularly specialists, are not available to teachers.	76	24
Inservice education offered is of little value for my job.	82	18
Inservice education focuses on school system needs rather than on teacher needs.	59	41
Inservice education is too general to satisfy my special needs.	76	24
Inservice education is not planned cooperatively with teachers.	76	12

In considering the information in Table 2, it should be noted that the total number of respondents included two special education

resource room teachers. In each instance, these teachers rated the statements in the negligible-to-moderate range, resulting perhaps in a slight bias in the data. In addition, since this measure was administered in October of 1976, after the teachers had become involved in planning the inservice training, some of their responses undoubtedly reflect that involvement.

All of the foregoing data supported the teachers' informal statements in May and June of 1976 relative to their need for and interest in attending inservice training in special education. As a result, the practicum participant assessed the multiplicity of needs indicated by the teachers, reviewed the literature, as described in the next section of this report, and focused on the following goals:

1. To increase teacher participants' skills in educational diagnosis of handicapped students

2. To increase teacher participants' skills in planning an effective program for handicapped students, and

3. To increase the length of time special education students were assigned to the regular classroom (mainstreamed)

This approach was approved by the principal of Catherine T. Reed Elementary School and by the practicum participant's immediate supervisor, the director of special education throughout the County. In addition, the County's Office of Staff Development was advised of the plan.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Although the public has fairly consistently demonstrated interest and demand for excellence in educational programs for the general school-age population, American society has shown insensitivity toward providing optimal educational services for the handicapped. However, over the past decade there has been a shift in public attitudes and an increase in awareness of the inequities in educational services for the handicapped. Recognition of problems faced by students requiring special education has led to State and Federal interventions.

Until very recently nationwide, even where school services for the handicapped did exist, organizational plans focused upon separating these services from the regular mainstream. Due to legislation by the Federal courts, this trend has been reversed and it is now mandated that placement of handicapped students be in the least restrictive school environment possible. Since states also require involvement of regular teachers in the education of handicapped students, new demands are being made on schools and teachers.

Prior to the recent trend, the Special Education Department of the Prince George's County Public School System decided that

it was ineffectual to continue increasing special classes and therefore became active in developing the resource teacher model. The conversion of special education students from containment in special education classrooms to partial assignment to resource room teachers (with some rather minimal assignments to regular classrooms) became the first steps in mainstreaming mildly handicapped students in the school system.

Generally, the mainstreaming approach involves moving the handicapped from self-contained special classes into the mainstream of education. In effect, the purpose is to promote handicapped students' interaction and integration with the regular school-age population.

The practicum participant reviewed literature related to mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students and inservice training of teachers that gave direction to selecting the strategy employed in this project.

Bases for Mainstreaming

Throughout the literature, four major forces appear to emerge as the dominant factors which have affected the development of the mainstreaming movement: parental pressure groups, the theoretical writings of professional educators, research findings, and the decisions emanating from State and Federal court proceedings. These factors are discussed separately, below.

Parental Pressure

The literature indicates that until 1948 most states had limited, if any, special educational services for the handicapped. During World War II, military tests for fitness and the return of newly handicapped individuals from the war brought attention to the problems of handicapping conditions. After World War II, parents of handicapped children became vocal and organized into politically agressive groups which fought to have laws enacted to ensure education for their children. They formed a number of organizations, such as the National Association for Retarded Citizens (first known as the National Association for Retarded Children) which was chartered in 1950. NARC has been instrumental in providing the leadership for the court cases that have been the springboard for attainment of educational rights for handicapped children.

Social and political parental power influenced state legislatures, and ultimately forced Congressional action, to rectify the inequities in educational services for handicapped children. With parents lobbying at every level, the Federal government established a national program in special education in 1961. States were encouraged through Federal assistance to provide programs for the mentally retarded. By 1963, Federal financial aid was available to states for implementation of programs for all handicapping conditions. Legal suits initiated by parents served as the bases for the Federal mandates that were instituted for educating the handicapped. This aspect is discussed more fully in the section on legislation, as it applies to the practicum.

Theoretical Concepts

In September 1968, Lloyd M. Dunn, frequently referred to as "Mr. Special Education," wrote an article in Journal of Exceptional Children which clearly stated the trend toward what is now called "the least restrictive environment." His emphasis was on the educable mentally retarded (who at that time were the focus of special education), but his words apply equally to the learning disabled and the emotionally disturbed:

> I have loyally supported and promoted special classes for the educable mentally retarded for most of the last 20 years, but with growing disaffection. In my view, much of our past and present practices are morally and educationally wrong. We have been living at the mercy of general educators who have referred their problem children to us. And we have been generally ill-prepared and ineffective in educating these children. Let us stop being pressured into continuing and expanding a special education program that we know now to be undesirable for many of the children we are dedicated to serve.
>
> There is an important difference between regular educators talking us into trying to remediate or live with the learning difficulties of pupils with which they haven't been able to deal versus striving to evolve a special education program that is either developmental in nature, wherein we assume responsibility for the total education of more severely handicapped children from an early age, or is supportive in nature, wherein general education would continue to have central responsibility for the vast majority of children with mild learning disabilites--with us serving as resource teachers in devising effective prescriptions and in tutoring such pupils.[1]

This discourse on the questionable efficacy of special classes by Dunn started an avalanche of similar articles and research findings

---

[1]Lloyd M. Dunn, "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded--Is Much of it Justifiable?" Journal of Exceptional Children 35 (September 1968): 5.

by educational theorists who had long agreed with Dunn's philosophy relative to the segregation of handicapped children within the school setting. The Tacoma (Washington) School Systems's plan for integrating handicapped children into regular classes, and other studies described under the research section of this review, attest to the fact that exceptional children achieve learning gains when they are mainstreamed with regular students.

In the 1970s, American education had begun to move toward diagnosis and prescriptive teaching with the intent of focusing on the individual's needs for instruction. With the wave of interest in individualized instruction which permeated the educational field, tracking and labeling of students were no longer viewed as the only alternatives for planning educational programs for students with special needs.

During this decade, the professional literature emanating from various disciplines (social, psychological, and medical, as well as educational) has been replete with information linking negative impact on the lives of handicapped children to their isolation from and non-participatory involvement in the mainstream of education. Through their writings, theorists concerned with education of the handicapped began to focus the public's attention on the undesirability and harmful effects of educational segregation of special education students within the school environment.

Theorists have described mainstreaming as follows. In his paper, "Mainstreaming: Idea and Actuality," Nyquist (1975) states, "Mainstreaming describes a movement in education to increase the amount of contact that a handicapped child has with non-handicapped children in normal everyday environments."[2] Similarly, Bloom (1975) has stated that mainstreaming means "helping exceptional people participate as much as possible in our society, particularly in public schools."[3] According to Reynolds and Birch (1977), "Mainstreaming is based on an inclusive attitude or general predisposition toward the education of children; that is, to provide education for as many children as possible in the regular class environment."[4]

In an article addressing the desirability of providing an alternative to the special education model for special education students, Lilly (1971) states his belief that there is sufficient evidence to stop placing mildly handicapped children in self-contained classes. The article specifically delineates this population as follows:

---

[2]Ewald E. Nyquist, Mainstreaming: Idea and Actuality (Albany, New York: University of the State of New York, 1975), p. 2.

[3]Arnold Bloom, The New York Education Department News (Albany, New York: Office of Public Information, 1975), p. 2.

[4]Maynard D. Reynolds and Jack W. Birch, Teaching Exceptional Children in All America's Schools (Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977), p. 5.

> The focus . . . is on the child whose problems can be seen as relatively mild, . . . educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, . . . learning disabled, . . . referred from regular education programs because of some sort of teacher-perceived behavioral or learning problem.[5]

The practicum effort focused on a population of handicapped school-age students similar to those to whom Lilly referred.

The population of handicapped students which Lilly excludes from his proposal for alternative programs are similar to the group of handicapped students that are not placed in regular schools in Prince George's County. In that the practicum effort dealt with handicapped children in a regular elementary school, this latter population of severely handicapped children were not affected by the practicum. Lilly describes this population as follows:

> The article does not refer to children who have been called trainable mentally retarded, severely emotionally disturbed, multiply handicapped, or to children who are so obviously deviant that they have never been enrolled in any kind of normal school program. . . . The real focus . . . is on that group of children traditionally labeled mildly handicapped.[6]

Research

In analyzing the literature to determine various procedures used in mainstreaming handicapped students in regular elementary schools, the practicum participant selected three research studies relevant to the practicum effort.

[5]Stephen M. Lilly, "A Training Based Model for Special Education," Journal of Exceptional Children 37 (Summer 1971): 745.

[6]Ibid., p. 745.

Guerin and Szatlocky (1974) studied mainstreaming of mildly mentally retarded students in eight California elementary public school districts. Of the four purposes of their study, two were related to the practicum. They are: 1) investigation of procedures used for mainstreaming and 2) identification of similarities and differences among various programs and the length of time each student was mainstreamed during the school day. The subjects were 27 mildly retarded students and 54 randomly selected non-retarded students in the same regular classrooms. Retarded students, with IQs ranging from 54 to 73 as measured by individual intelligence tests, were assigned to one of four mainstreaming models within the eight school districts.

These four models were: 1) Partial Integration--all retarded students were assigned to a special class and then programed into regular classrooms for a daily block of time, 2) Combination classes --all retarded students were integrated into regular classrooms all day. In this model, a regular classroom teacher with special education qualifications acted as a resource to other teachers, 3) Learning resource center-- housed in a centralized school, this center provided a regular classroom placement for retarded and other students. Special education teachers were available to give individual and/or small group instruction one or two hours daily, and 4) Learning disability groups--in addition to regular class placement,

students were instructed individually or in small groups for one or two hours daily. The findings showed that the attitudes of administrators relative to mainstreaming of these retarded students were positive, with one exception, and the majority of teachers responded positively. The combination classes and the learning resource center provided optimal levels of integration and also received the strongest regular and special teacher endorsement. The partial integration method, where students were assigned to a special class with a short time in regular class, was used most frequently, yet it gained the least amount of regular and special teacher support.

In order to obtain relevant information prior to mainstreaming special education students, Harig and Krug (1975) conducted a study of 48 elementary-age students classified as mentally retarded. Students were randomly placed in four separate classrooms with enrollments of twelve students each, for one year, to determine academic gains. Two of the classes were randomly selected as experimental and the other two served as controls. The mean IQ of the experimental group was 72.3 and the control mean was 71.9. The entering mean ages of students ranged from 9.11 to 10.11 and the entering academic levels in reading and math for the experimental and control groups ranged from 1.5 to 1.9. At the end of the one-year period, the following results were obtained: based on a specialized instructional program, the experimental group made a reading gain of 1.35 and an arithmetic gain of 1.61; the control group gained .45 in reading and .48 in mathematics.

The one-year follow-up showed that, socially, teachers ranked the majority of the handicapped students from both groups in the upper two-thirds of the class. For future class placement for these handicapped students, teachers felt that 76 percent of the experimentally placed and 61 percent of the control-placed could remain in regular class without special help. Most important, none of the students were recommended for special class placement. Any special assistance would take place in the regular classroom. The study reinforces the assumption that a high number of special education students are capable of progressing at their normal growth in regular programs.

From their investigation of teacher attitudes toward integrating handicapped students into regular classes with supportive resource room services, Shotel, Iona, and McGettigan (May 1972) concluded that inservice training which focuses on teaching strategies for working with the handicapped, observations of handicapped students in resource rooms, and constant communication between resource room and regular teachers will probably have the greatest influence on regular teachers' attitudes. The investigators developed a 13-item questionnaire relative to teacher attitudes toward handicapped students' assignment in regular classrooms. The number of elementary teachers responding to the questionnaire were 128.

The findings showed that integrating handicapped students in regular classes with resource support had moderately positive effects

on teacher attitudes toward the emotionally disturbed and minimal if any, effects on teacher attitudes toward the educable retarded and the learning disabled; teachers were more optimistic in their attitudes toward emotionally disturbed and learning disabled children being integrated into regular classes than the educable mentally retarded. The researchers also believe that a non-graded organizational plan is necessary for successful integration.

The practicum participant was aware of the need for handicapped children to participate more successfully in the mainstream of regular education. As information surfaces from the academic successes of handicapped students participating in regular classes as well as from instructional practices demonstrated by some regular education teachers, there is an accumulation of evidence which supports the contention that mainstreaming, with support services when needed, provides the most appropriate approach for most mildly handicapped students.

Legislation

Legislation that emanated from such court cases as the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens (PARC) vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1972) and Mills vs. Board of Education (Education USA 1977) has extended right-to-education rulings for the school-age handicapped. The Education for Handicapped Act (P.L. 94-142) which was passed in 1975 mandates a free public education for all handicapped children aged 3 to 17

(by September 1, 1978) and aged 3 to 21 (by September 1, 1980). This law prevails unless it is contrary to the laws of the states involved. The law not only demands that all handicapped children must be educated with public funds but that programs be designed and implemented in the least restrictive educational setting. No longer will separate educational programs, apart from the mainstream, be indiscriminately allowed for the handicapped.

One of the main tenets of P.L. 94-142 deals with education of the handicapped in the least restrictive possible environment. Heretofore, in many localities, school programs for exceptional students were based upon assignment to special schools and special classes. These placements were deemed highly restrictive by P.L. 94-142, and in order for local education agencies to be in compliance with prevailing law, handicapped students must now be assigned to the least restrictive school setting possible, which is translatable to all students having the opportunity, when appropriate, to participate in regular classes.

Joseph A. Califano, in a speech at the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals in May 1977 discussed the civil rights of the school-age handicapped by stating: "Handicapped children must not be segregated in the public schools, but must be educated with the non-handicapped in regular classrooms to the maximum extent possible."[7]

---

[7] U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Programs for Handicapped Individuals (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, July 1977), p. 7.

The current movement toward mainstreaming has resulted from the various educational, theoretical, and legal forces that have emerged to foster the right of all handicapped to be educated in the least restrictive environment possible.

Practices in Mainstreaming

In providing education for the handicapped through implementation of mainstreaming mandates, states and local education agencies have developed a variety of models. Across the country, implementation of mainstreaming exists in varying stages of development. For example, the strategy for mainstreaming that underlies the master plan of the California State Department of Education specifies that "Emphases in local programs will be on integrating handicapped children, to the extent feasible, into the regular instruction program."[8]

In support of integration of handicapped students within the school setting, the Massachusetts Department of Education specifically states the ways in which mainstreaming of handicapped students in that state must be implemented. Similarly, the Tennessee State Department of Education has adopted the following theory on mainstreaming:

> Special classes, separate schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment, shall occur only when and to the extent that the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes, even with the use of supplementary aids and services, cannot be accomplished satisfactorily.[9]

---

[8]National Education Association, Mainstreaming, Infopac No. 9 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975), p. 1.

[9]Ibid., p. 5.

Whereas some states have taken a more general view toward the mainstreaming approach, the Office of Public Instruction for the State of Montana points out specific directions for accomplishing this goal: "Individual assistance for a person should be accomplished through the utilization of the least restrictive environment."[10]

The Department of Special Education in the State of Maryland, in which the practicum effort is located, developed a mainstreaming program called "A Continuum Design for Handicapped Children" (1975). The primary goal of the program was to encourage local education agencies to maintain handicapped school-age students, those who are mildly-to-moderately handicapped, in the mainstream of education rather than in self-contained special education classes. The Maryland Continuum Design consists of six programs which focus on the learning needs and strengths of each individual.

The literature does not indicate any one way to mainstream special education students. There are a diversity of educational alternatives available and their effectiveness for any student requiring additional educational services will depend upon unique differences and needs. For optimal effectiveness, educators must interpret the mandates for mainstreaming in terms of providing educational alternatives that appear to be the most appropriate for each student.

---

[10]Ibid., p. 6.

competent in the skills required to aid a child in reaching his full potential."[12]

As one of its actionary steps, the U.S. Office of Education has funded Project Accept, sponsored by the University of Kansas Department of Special Education, which serves participating faculties in selected Kansas schools through what is called the University Support Center (USC). The rationale for this teacher training program is to provide a supportive system for regular classroom teachers as they embark upon extending equal educational opportunities to all children, including the handicapped. Project Accept is an inservice training program to assist regular classroom teachers improve their attitudes and skills with regard to instructing handicapped children. Proponents of this model believe that traditional training programs have failed to prepare classroom teachers to deal with these children. Project Accept is based on some of the same premises that were incorporated in the inservice training model implemented in this practicum. These premises are:

> . . . that teachers participate willingly in training that meets their learning needs, as they see them.
>
> . . . that by designing their own training program with guidance . . . from the support center, teachers become motivated to invest time and energy to improve their instructional skills.

---

[12] U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Proceedings of the Conference on Research Needs Related to the Development of Personnel to Serve the Handicapped (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1975), p. viii.

> . . . that involvement on the part of teachers, building administrators, and special resource personnel effects new patterns of behavior and interpersonal support that remain long after the project involvement has ended.[13]

Project Accept developed and implemented its inservice training plan according to the identified needs of the professional personnel in the school involved. Comparably, the training institute in this practicum was based on the needs perceived by the faculty at Catherine T. Reed Elementary School.

Direction for the development and implementation of this practicum were drawn from two models found in the literature: an adaptation of the Arizona State Model for Special Education Learning Experiences for Competency in Teaching (SELECT 1974) and an adaptation of Project Acumen: Preparing Teachers to Educate Exceptional Children in Regular Class Settings (1975).

The Arizona Department of Education, Division of Special Education, in conjunction with Northern Arizona University's Department of Special Education, developed SELECT as a special study institute series to enable personnel who work with the handicapped to have an opportunity to improve and increase their skills and competencies. This training program was developed with Title VI-D funds from the Federal government. The organization plan of each institute training module is divided into components with competencies to be mastered under each component.

---

[13] Project Accept (Kansas: University of Kansas Department of Special Education, n.d.), p. 1.

A ten-hour training period is allowed for each component. A total of five weekends are required to complete a module. Participants may earn graduate and undergraduate credit up to three hours depending upon the institutes completed. There are ten training modules from which participants may select, or specific components may be designed to meet identified training needs.

The practicum participant used an adaptation of this model for the inservice training institute for Catherine T. Reed Elementary School, modifying it to the training needs the teachers in that school had.

Project Acumen: Preparing Teachers to Educate Exceptional Children in Regular Class Settings (1975) was also used as a model for the practicum. That project was performed under a grant, sponsored by the Federal government, to train personnel for working with the handicapped. The Division of Special Education of the Department of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina undertook this project in conjunction with the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Project Acumen focused on improving teacher competencies so that educational needs of mildly handicapped elementary-age children could be met in regular class settings and also assisted selected school staff members to design and implement their own staff development programs.

The practicum participant incorporated some of the Project Acumen concepts and designs in the practicum training institute.

The pre- and post-test Teacher Survey Forms used in the practicum were adapted from Davis and McCallon's work in connection with Project Acumen. The content of Project Acumen was reviewed, cross-referenced, and compared with the needs identified by the teachers at Catherine T. Reed Elementary School and with their needs as determined by more objective measures.

Summary

The practicum participant was aware of the importance of preparing regular teachers to work with special education students before successful mainstreaming could take place. In reviewing the literature, it appears that far too many school systems embark on implementation of the mainstreaming approach without a formalized evaluation of regular teacher readiness. Conversely, the course of action followed by the Prince George's County School System, and more specifically, in terms of this paper, Catherine T. Reed Elementary School was to make a systematic exploration of the factors involved in mainstreaming before embarking on the project.

CHAPTER III

OBJECTIVES

The surveys and other data in Chapter I indicated that regular classroom teachers felt a need for a training program that would result in the improvement of education for special education students. In order to develop a plan to satisfy this need, it was necessary for the practicum participant to focus on measurable objectives. Thus, specific objectives were developed for teacher training and for students. These objectives are described below, along with the rationale involved in their selection.

Objective I

To increase teachers' skills in educational diagnoses of handicapped students by at least 40 percent more on the post-test than was evidenced on the pre-test.

Objective II

To increase teachers' skills in planning effective educational programs for mildly handicapped students by at least 30 percent more on the post-test than was evidenced in the pre-test.

Rationale for Objectives I and II

It was felt that increasing teachers' knowledge about the learning characteristics of special students, about educational diagnosis and skill assessment for these students, and about

techniques of classroom management and so forth should also improve teachers' attitudes toward special students. Furthermore, it was felt that this would result in an increase in the classroom teachers' receptivity toward the special students being integrated into their regular classrooms.

Objective III

Following the training institute, 50 percent of the 18 more severely handicapped special education students who had previously been attending self-contained classes (and who attended regular classes for only one 30-minute period per day) would increase time spent in regular classes to at least two periods.

Rationale for Objective III

For special students, this practicum effort focused, of necessity, on increasing the length of time they would attend regular classes. To do otherwise, i.e., to focus on increase in academic gains of students, would have necessitated testing and/or formal observation of students. In Prince George's County, it is politically unsound and professionally unwise to gather data on students for reasons other than those designed by the school system. This placed a limitation on the practicum effort.

In summary, the objectives of the practicum were to aid teachers in developing effective diagnostic skills and instructional knowledge relative to educational programming for handicapped

students while at the same time developing a more positive attitude toward integration of the students into regular classes for longer periods of time.

CHAPTER IV

STRATEGY

Rejected Strategies

Several strategies to ameliorate the mainstreaming problem at Catherine T. Reed Elementary School were proposed and rejected before the ultimate plan was accepted. Proposals that were rejected included:

1. An existing County staff development program in the form of mini-courses that was available to all teachers. The mini-courses had been developed in units of five sessions and participants could receive one-fifth of a credit at the County level for each session. However, only one session would be devoted to educational diagnosis of special education students. The faculty at Catherine T. Reed Elementary rejected this plan because it was too limiting, was open to all professionals in the school system, and they wanted a training program that would focus only on their needs, their students, and their school.

2. Three workshop sessions before usual school hours to increase the teachers' skills in educational programming. This plan was eliminated because too few teachers made commitments to attend due to other early morning commitments.

3. Increasing the amount of time special education students would spend in regular classrooms through a team approach (the resource room teacher and the chairman of each grade level).

The grade-level chairman would assist the resource room teacher in selecting the grade level and subject or activity that would be educationally beneficial for each student. This strategy was abandoned when the grade-level chairmen stated they did not feel any more competent to accept this responsibility than the classroom teachers who had the students in their classes.

Rationale for Strategy Chosen

The strategy chosen evolved from discussions with teachers, administrators, and consultants; review of the literature; and classroom observations. The strategy selected reflected the stated concerns, interests, and scheduling preferences of the faculty involved.

In order to meet the first two program objectives--to increase teacher participants' skills in educational diagnosis and planning of educational programs for handicapped students--a training institute consisting of 15 sessions for teacher training in special education was designed and took place during the spring semester from January of 1977 to April of 1977 on Wednesdays from 3 to 6 p.m. The actual implementation of the program and its design are described in Chapter V.

Each participant who attended the fifteen sessions received three hours of credit from the Maryland State Department of Education. This type of credit can be applied toward renewal of teachers' certificates and/or salary increases, and was considered an important motivator. (The teachers' originally stated

preference for two-hour sessions lasting from 3 to 5 p.m. was modified to three-hour sessions from 3 to 6 p.m. to meet State credit requirements, with total agreement from the teachers.)

In order to meet the third program objective--to increase the amount of time the 18 more severely handicapped children would spend in regular classrooms--the design of the training institute was aimed at having the regular classroom teachers apply their newly acquired diagnostic, programing, and teaching skills toward improved educational experiences for these students in the mainstream classes. It was assumed that the special students would then be able to attend regular classes, beneficially, for longer periods of time. An increase in the amount of time the more severely handicapped students attended regular classes would indicate the impact of the training program on students, as stated in Chapter III.

In addition, two other specific strategies were designed. First, the special education resource room teachers would provide support and consultation services to the regular classroom teachers in their daily work with exceptional students. Their services would also include initiation of referrals to out-of-school agencies for needed interventions. Secondly, each teacher participant would provide the leadership for the bi-monthly School Instructional Team meetings, at which problems concerning special education students would be discussed. It was anticipated that

the teachers' attention to individual special education students' academic problems would impact favorably on both the students and the teachers.

CHAPTER V

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRAINING INSTITUTE

Development

Beginning in September of the first semester of the 1976-1977 school year, the practicum participant began planning for the training program which took place the second semester. Preliminary steps to achieve the first and second practicum objectives (relative to teacher training) included several procedures. First, the author held three meetings with the teacher task force in which additional information from teachers was obtained relative to the desired format for the training program. The second aspect involved administration and interpretation of pre-tests (previously discussed), which were used to further determine the teachers' instructional needs. (See Appendixes C and D, and Tables 1 and 2.)

The practicum participant then began to develop the inservice training program based upon the teachers' statements of their needs for instructional skills and materials, and from review of the literature. The two teacher training programs the practicum participant selected from the literature as guidelines were an adaptation of the Arizona State Model for Special Education Learning Experiences for Competency in Teaching (SELECT 1974) and an adaptation of Project Acumen: Preparing Teachers to Educate Exceptional Children in Regular Class Settings (1975).

The training program, designated as STEP (Special Training for Educational Programming), consisted of four modules, as described below. It is described in more complete detail in Appendix E. Each module had separate components, aimed at developing teacher competencies under each component. This inservice training institute consisted of 15 sessions which were held three hours weekly for 15 weeks, from January to April of 1977.

In broad outline, the training package was as follows:

Module		No. of Sessions
I.	Identification of Students with Special Needs	4
II.	Special Education Programs and Services	4
III.	Techniques of Classroom Management	4
IV.	Evaluation and Accountability for Students with Special Needs	3

All participants received a copy of the syllabus (again, see Appendix E). Consultants were selected; committees were organized to fulfill duties in preparation for, and during, the training institute. Twenty consultants were engaged to participate in the training institute (for more detail, see the section on operation of the institute, below). The committees, from the school, dealt with facilities and environmental space (where class was held), refreshments (coffee and pastries were available at each session), and a special library (involving circulation of the books and materials the practicum participant had obtained for the course).

As an additional part of the planning process, various forms were developed for evaluating the effectiveness of the training institute and the progress of the teacher participants:

To assess teachers' mastery of each module, they would be assigned Module Assessment Tasks (see Appendix F), which they would submit in written form, for evaluation by the practicum participant and others. Further, feedback forms to be completed by the teacher participants at the end of each module were designed (see Appendix G). These forms were intended not only to yield corrective information for succeeding modules but also as an evaluative measure of the practicum. Finally, a form to obtain feedback from the consultants to the training institute was designed (see Appendix H).

In addition, in conformance with State regulations, a plan for the inservice activity was filed with the school systems' Office of Staff Development, to ensure that participants did in fact receive three hours of credit from the Maryland State Department of Education (see Appendix I).

Operation

In January of 1977, the training institute was initiated. Participants included 11 regular elementary teachers (K-6), a reading teacher, two special education resource teachers, and the vice principal of the school, a total of 15 participants.

The timeframe for the training has been described earlier: 15 sessions, after school, on Wednesdays for three hours. The setting for these sessions was two large classrooms at Catherine T. Reed Elementary School. In addition to one classroom set aside for the major activities, one space was designated as the media room where professional books and instructional materials were housed. Visual and audio media such as videotapes, films, filmstrips, and language masters were utilized in this space.

The training package (Appendix E) provided the content for the course. For each of the four modules, the practicum participant and 20 consultants from special education and other disciplines provided the instructional leadership. Specifically, special education personnel, general educators, and a specially qualified parent of a handicapped child were involved in conducting the training activities of the program. The consultants' professional qualifications were: director of special education, supervisor of special education, school psychologist, learning problems resource specialist, speech and hearing specialist, early identification specialist, motor development specialist, a coordinator of special education, and principals of special education schools. Also, special education resource teachers from another elementary school, the special education legal specialist, and a nurse who is also a parent of a handicapped student were involved in the training program, either as presentors

or disseminators of printed material which explained a specific area of special education.

In conferring with the consultants (all of whom had copies of the syllabus) about the training program, the practicum participant stressed the importance of structuring the class sessions for teachers so that participants would develop specific competencies. The practicum participant fostered the concept of the desirability of structuring each session as a model for participants to use daily in their classrooms. In this regard, Peck and Tucker (1973) isolate and discuss research related to teacher training. They believe that "teacher educators should practice what they preach." Peck and Tucker further point out that "when teachers are treated the same way they are supposed to treat their pupils, they are more likely to adopt the desired style of teaching behavior."[1]

The teaching methodology was presented through lectures; discussions; demonstrations; audiovisual materials such as videotapes, filmstrips, slides, and movies; games; and motor development activities. The teaching-learning activities also included active involvement by participants.

At each class session, handouts on each topic discussed were passed out. Additional readings, discussions, and instruction

[1]Robert F. Peck and James A. Tucker, "Research on Teacher Education: What the Available Research Appears to Demonstrate," in Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. Robert M.W. Travers (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973), p. 943.

in specific procedures were provided when necessary. The consultants followed a specific structure, since they had been informed of the needs assessment of participants and the overall purpose of the training program.

Participants appeared receptive to the presentations. The questions, with responses from consultants and/or the audience, provided lively and challenging verbal interactions. The participants' formal evaluation of the institute is discussed in Chapter VI.

In accordance with the strategy planned, the school's special education resource room teachers provided support and consultation services on a routine basis to the regular classroom teachers as they carried out their daily work with exceptional students. The resource room teachers also made referrals, as necessary, to the public health nurse, the psychologist for testing and/or family counseling, and to any other needed and available family resource or community service. In so doing, they made the regular classroom teachers more aware of, and involved in, ensuring that such services were available to students, as needed.

As had also been planned, each regular classroom teacher involved in the program, in alphabetical order, served as chairperson for the School Instructional Team meetings, which involved collection of information on the progress of students discussed and presentation and coordination of that information. Previous to this effort, the classroom teachers had only listened to information presented by

the experts concerning the handicapped children in their classrooms. They were now actively involved, and although no formal evaluative measures were designed or taken for this aspect of the program, there was an observable change in their participation and enthusiasm during these sessions.

CHAPTER VI

EVALUATION

Evaluation of the practicum effort consisted of two types of measurements: 1) attainment of the objectives set forth in Chapter III and 2) evaluation of the training institute itself. The first practicum objective, of increasing teachers' skills in educational diagnoses of handicapped students, and the second objective, of increasing teachers' skills in planning effective educational programs for mildly handicapped students, were measured by pre- and post-test data collected from the Teacher Survey Form (Appendix C) and the Survey of Instructional Problems (Appendix D).

In addition, the practicum participant constructed tasks for teacher participants for each module of the training institute (see Appendix F, Module Assessment Tasks for the STEP Program). Participants' written responses to these assignments indicated the level of knowledge gained from each module. The tasks were assigned to the participants at the last session of each module, were graded, and were returned to the teachers the following week.

The module tasks were designed with a two-fold purpose. The written responses to these tasks provided information so the practicum participant could determine the degree to which teacher participants were attaining the instructional goals. Additionally, the essay tests for the tasks served as a tool to give feedback

to the teachers about their attainment of the competencies fostered by each component of the modules. Thus, the suitability of the training materials and the progress of the teacher participants were monitored simultaneously.

Essay tests were selected for the module assessment tasks because they required participants to respond by analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information presented while applying the information to realistic classroom situations. The pass/no pass method of grading was chosen for the training institute. The practicum participant believed that this method of reviewing participants' written responses was both appropriate and desirable because the training institute was requested by the teachers and participation was completely voluntary. Therefore, a non-competitive grading system was preferred. This system afforded each participant the opportunity to engage in activities where the focus was on learning and developing skills rather than on emphasizing the gaining of specific grades. The pass/no pass system was also acceptable for teacher credit with the State of Maryland Board of Education.

In this connection, Rose and Trent (1973) present research findings relative to grading systems in higher education. They point out that those who are in favor of non-competitive grading systems believe that more learning takes place when students are not competing for grades and that "encouraging learning through

grades . . . is contrary to the contemporary educational philosophy which says a student should study because he is interested in the subject."[1]

The minimum level for acceptable (pass) performance on the module assessment tasks was 70 percent; the practicum participant selected this minimum level after having reviewed several sources dealing with criterion measures for determining learner achievement. Robert Mager (1962) suggests that although there are times when it is impossible to specify an exact criterion, one must still set some kind of measure that the learner will strive to attain. He states, "You should be able to find some way to evaluate anything you think is important enough to spend a significant amount of time teaching."[2] To measure the extent of the knowledge institute participants gained from each of the modules, the practicum participant also relied upon information obtained from Michael Scriven's study guide on evaluation (1974). He states, "It is often useful to employ more than one criterion in determining how well a particular objective has been achieved."[3] The 70 percent level for a pass grade was also acceptable for teacher credit with the Maryland State Board of Education.

---

[1]Clare Rose and James W. Trent, "Research on Teaching in Higher Education, Student Characteristics and the Learning Process," in Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. Robert M. W. Travers (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973), p. 943.

[2]Robert F. Mager, Preparing Instructional Objectives (Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962), p. 44.

[3]Michael Scriven, Evaluation, A Study Guide for Educational Administrators (Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, 1974), p. 172.

As is discussed in more detail below, the remaining evaluation measures consisted of tabulation of the number of regular classroom periods attended by handicapped children following the training institute, and evaluation of the training institute itself by teacher participants and consultants (see Appendixes G and H, respectively).

Measurement of Results

Objectives I and II

The first and second practicum objectives were measured, in part, by pre- and post-test data obtained from an adaptation of the Teacher Survey Form developed by Davis and McCallon (1974). The form is shown in Appendix C. Table 3 compares the pre- and post-test results on this form for the first two practicum objectives.

Examination of the data clearly shows that the first objective of increasing teachers' skills in educational diagnoses of handicapped children by 40 percent more on the post-test than the pre-test was achieved. The pre-test showed that 22 percent felt able to make educational diagnoses for handicapped students whereas the post-test indicated that 73 percent felt able to perform this task, an increase of 51 percent.

The second objective of increasing teachers's skills in planning effective educational programs for mildly handicapped students by at least 30 percent more on the post-test than the pre-test was also more than met. As Table 3 shows, 47 percent

of the participants felt able to perform this task at the time of the pre-test whereas 94 percent believed they were able to carry out this task at the time of the post-test, an increase of 47 percent. Table 3 shows two other responses that are more indirectly related to the two major objectives. These responses also indicate a sizable increase in the percentage of teachers who felt capable of performing the indicated functions after completing the training institute.

Table 3

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results on Teacher Survey Form

Positive Statements*	Percentages	
	Pre-Test October 1976 N = 17	Post-Test April 1977 N = 15
Objective I		
I am able to educationally diagnose handicapped students	47	73
I can evaluate students' preferred learning modalities	28	73
Objective II		
I am able to prepare an effective educational program for mildly handicapped students	22	94
I can adapt my classroom curriculum to the learning styles of children	47	100

*Data were tabulated from the positive scale (numbers 5 and 4) on the pre- and post-tests (see Appendix C).

The Module Assessment Tasks (see Appendix F) were also used as supportive data to substantiate the achievement of the first and second practicum objectives--increasing teachers' skills in educational diagnoses of handicapped children and in planning effective educational programs for mildly handicapped students. To ensure the usefulness of the pass/fail grading system as a measure of participants' learning, two levels of the pass category were set up: a high pass with 100 percent accuracy to 85 percent accuracy; a low pass with 84 to 70 percent accuracy. (Additional learning tasks for individuals were to be assigned to those participants not attaining at least 70 percent on any of the tasks. However, since all participants maintained levels above 70 percent throughout the sessions, this procedure was not utilized.)

The purpose of assessing the task modules at two levels of the pass category was to give the practicum participant an indication of how much learning was taking place and whether additional teaching interventions were needed. However, the scheduled sessions were sufficient for handling issues, concerns, and questions relative to the training institute and its content. Further, the classroom management techniques utilized by consultants provided an environment in which participants were encouraged to participate and to present problems and questions.

Table 4 shows the cumulative percentage achieved by each participant over the four modules. It should be remembered that

Module I was specifically related to development of teachers' diagnostic skills with handicapped children and that Module III focused upon educational programming for these children. Modules II and IV were also directed toward these objectives, more indirectly.

Table 4

Cumulative High-Pass and Low-Pass Scores for the Participants on the Four Module Assessment Tasks

Teacher Participant N = 15	Scores in Percentages* High Pass (85 - 100)	Low Pass (70 - 84)
A	100	
B	98	
C	95	
D	95	
E	93	
F	90	
G	90	
H	85	
I	85	
J	85	
K	85	
L		75
M		75
N		75
O		75

* Only pass scores are shown, since in no instance did any participant attain a score lower than 70 on any module task.

As Table 4 shows, 73 percent of the teachers achieved mastery of the module assessment tasks at the high-pass level (85 to 100 percent accuracy). Only four of the teachers fell into the low-pass category, with none falling into the no-pass category at any time. Since all four modules were aimed at fulfilling the first two objectives of the practicum, these scores are strongly indicative of the success of the practicum. The participants clearly increased their diagnostic skills and their skills relative to the improvement of educational programing for special students.

The teachers' feelings about mainstreaming handicapped children and about in-service education to equip them to deal effectively with these children in the classroom were considered important both to development of a suitable program and to the achievement of the first two practicum objectives. These areas were explored with the teachers in pre- and post-test Surveys of Instructional Problems, adapted from the N.E.A. Survey of Instructional Problems (1976). The survey used for the pre- and post-tests is shown in Appendix D. In comparison with the pre-test data, the post-test results show an increase in the positive responses of teachers to mainstreaming and in-service education, as is depicted in Table 5. The percentage of teachers who considered a lack of appropriate materials for teachers and children a serious-to-critical matter dropped from 82 percent on the pre-test to 13 percent on the post-test.

Table 5

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results on Survey of Instructional Problems

Statement	Percent Serious-Critical	
	Pre-Test October 1976 N = 17	Post-Test April 1977 N = 15
Teachers are not consulted before handicapped children are placed in their classes.	41	13
Handicapped children are moved into regular classes without considering their special needs.	35	0
Regular students are adversely affected by mainstreaming.	47	7
Appropriate materials are not provided for teachers and the handicapped children.	82	13
Supporting services, particularly specialists, are not avaliable to teachers.	24	6
Inservice education offered is of little value for my job.	18	7
Inservice education focuses on school system needs rather than on teacher needs.	41	27
Inservice education is too general to satisfy my special needs.	24	7
Inservice education is not planned cooperatively with teachers.	12	7

This drop in concern about materials can be directly attributed to the training institute, and the materials provided in connection with it. Also important, 35 percent of the teachers felt that handicapped children were moved into regular classes without considering their needs on the pre-test; on the post-test, following the training institute, not even one teacher reported such feelings. Whereas 47 percent of the teachers had felt that regular students were adversely affected by mainstreaming on the pre-test, only 7 percent felt that this was true when post-tested. As can be observed from the table, this trend toward more positive response to both mainstreaming handicapped children and toward inservice education is consistent for all items asked.

To summarize the above findings, it would appear that the practicum effort more than met the expectations for Objectives I and II.

Objective III

The third objective, that after the training institute 50 percent of the 18 more severely handicapped special education students' time spent in regular classrooms would increase from one period to at least two periods, was also achieved. For the purposes of this practicum, regular classroom assignment meant that students would be receiving academic instruction in language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science in regular classes.

The total number of special education students attending Catherine T. Reed Elementary School at the outset of the program was 45, which included all of the special education students who were receiving resource room services at that time. However, the objectives of the program focused upon the 18 more severely handicapped students who had been in the two self-contained classrooms during school year 1975-76, before the special education program in the school was converted to resource rooms. Without the special education self-contained classrooms, these 18 students spent almost all of their academic periods in the resource room because the regular teachers believed that they were unable to program for these students.

In implementing the practicum, the intent of the practicum participant was to demonstrate that the 18 students could be provided an appropriate education program in a minimally restrictive environment which would entail a decrease of periods they spent in special education classrooms. The objective of the practicum was to decrease the number of periods the 18 students were serviced in the resource room by increasing the number of periods these special education students were assigned to regular classes.

Prior to the training institute, none of the 18 students attended regular classrooms for more than one 30-minute period per day. Following the training institute, eight of these students attended regular classes for two periods a day and three attended regular classes for three periods a day. The remaining seven

continued to attend regular classes for only one period per day. (The latter seven children had special education diagnoses and day-to-day learning problems that mandated against their placement in regular programs for more than one period per day.) Thus, the third objective, that 50 percent of the 18 more severely handicapped students would increase their attendance in regular classrooms from one to at least two periods per day, was achieved, since 61 percent of the students were mainstreamed for two or more periods per day after the training institute.

Evaluation of the Practicum

The teacher participants and the consultants who participated in the training institute evaluated the practicum effort, as is described below.

Teachers' Evaluation of the Training Institute

A participant feedback form adapted from Davis and McCallon's instruments (1974) was utilized to collect information relative to participants' evaluations of the practicum (see Appendix G for the form). At the end of each module in the training institute, written responses were entered by the teacher participants on the feedback form.

As noted in Table 6, for all four modules, 100 percent of the participants rated the objectives, materials, consultants, structure, and aids to learning positively. The practicum participant's analysis of the comments about suggested improvements or problems resulted in only one area--the facility--about which participants expressed concern. The responses to the questions about the facility indicated that 73 percent felt that the rooms were too cold

Table 6

Teachers' Positive Assessment of the Training Institute*

(in percentages)

N = 15

Assessment Categories	Module			
	I	II	III	IV
Objectives	100	100	100	100
Materials	100	100	100	100
Consultants	100	100	100	100
Structure	100	100	100	100
Aids to Learning	100	100	100	100
Facility	27	100	73	100
Future Needs	87	80	65	80
Timing of Learning Activities	93	74	75	93
Methods				
Audiovisual	20	12	5	20
Combination**	60	7	0	47
Group Discussions	0	26	45	13
Lectures	0	7	10	20
Visitations	0	20	25	0
Energy/Attention	100	87	80	86

*Positive assessment was determined by the number of "yes" responses to the questions on the Participant Feedback Form (see Appendix G).

**Combination refers to the responses of participants who selected a variety of methods, i.e., discussions, lectures, audiovisuals, visitations, etc.

during Module I. The energy crisis, which necessitated that the school system maintain heating thermostats at a minimum level, and the location of the rooms at outside building positions, contributed to this problem. However, after the first module and as the weather became warmer, this problem was virtually eliminated.

In the area of the methods utilized in the training institute, as shown in Table 6, participants preferred a combination of methods for Modules I and IV (Identification of Students with Special Needs, and Evaluation and Accountability for Students with Special Needs, respectively). For Modules II and III (Special Education Programs and Services, and Techniques of Classroom Management, respectively), group discussions ranked highest. The practicum participant believes these preferences were due to the nature of the content of each of these modules, and that the teachers felt more comfortable and at ease about asking questions and joining in discussions during Modules II and III than they did during Modules I and IV.

Although relatively few teachers expressed a need for more information in terms of teaching special education students, the practicum participant feels that note should be taken of these responses, since it indicates their interest in dealing effectively with handicapped students. Analysis of the participants' future concerns showed that they felt they needed 1) courses explaining the causes of handicapping conditions, 2) fuller understanding of

special education programs, 3) more knowledge about the orthopedically handicapped, 4) further training to identify the needs of students, 5) additional information on infants and toddlers (since the law specifies early identification and work in special education), and 6) learning to deal with mainstreaming.

Consultants' Evaluation of the Training Institute

Twenty consultants responded to the Evaluation Form for Consultants (see Appendix H for the form). These consultants rated 10 items evaluating the training institute, using a five-point scale ranging from agree strongly to disagree strongly. Their responses are shown in Table 7. For purposes of discussion of the results, trends that were clearly negative or positive represent a combination of the two "agree" or two "disagree" categories, respectively. All other results are spelled out in terms of the specific category involved.

Ninety-five percent of the consultants felt that the objectives for the sessions were not too broad, with 90 percent feeling strongly that the topics were explored in depth. Seventy-five percent of the consultants agreed that the degree of participation was high, although 85 percent felt that there was not enough time to discuss the topics. All of the consultants (100 percent) felt that the participants were more knowledgeable at the completion of the sessions. Thirty percent of the consultants agreed with the participants that the physical surroundings were uncomfortable. The practicum participant feels that this was due to the limited amount of heat in the classrooms during the months of January and

February. All 20 consultants stated that they were satisfied with the overall presentation of the sessions.

Table 7

Consultants' Evaluation of the Training Institute

(in percentages)

N = 20

Items	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly*
The physical surroundings were comfortable	35	35	30	0
There were too many participants in the groups	0	20	25	55
The objectives for the sessions were too broad	0	5	0	95
There were limitations imposed on the methodology to be used in conducting my session	0	0	0	100
The topics were explored in depth	90	10	0	0
There were many issues on the topic not discussed	5	10	5	80
There was not enough time to discuss the topics	15	70	0	15
The degree of participation was high	40	35	20	5
The participants were more knowledgeable at the end of the session	70	30	0	0
I was satisfied with the overall presentation of my session	55	45	0	0

*The "undecided" category shown in Appendix H is omitted from this table because in no instance did a consultant respond in that category.

In summary, the various evaluative measures indicate that all three of the practicum objectives were more than met, and that participants and consultants involved in the training institute evaluated it favorably.

CHAPTER VII

INSTITUTIONALIZING THE RESULTS

A resource materials center was set up at Catherine T. Reed Elementary School in response to the teachers' statements on the October 1976 Survey of Instructional Problems that they lacked appropriate materials for teaching handicapped children. On the basis of the success of the training institute, the practicum participant allocated funds from the special education budget for the school year 1977-1978 (following the training institute which was completed in April of 1977), and also committed additional funds for the ensuing year. Professional books, periodicals, journals, and instructional materials in the area of special education were purchased.

The resource materials room was utilized as space where teachers developed instructional materials. Special education teachers borrowed learning packages from the County's Special Education Library on a monthly basis. These learning packages were used as guides for regular education teachers to develop their own materials.

An unanticipated event occurred in September of 1977 which had a tremendous impact on institutionalization of the practicum effort. During the months of June and July of 1977, the Board of Education of Prince George's County began seeking space for a unit in an elementary school to house 65 orthopedically

handicapped students whose ages ranged from five to twelve. The elementary school where these students had been enrolled was deemed in need of extensive repairs, which necessitated finding other space for the children. Since rooms were available at Catherine T. Reed Elementary, the decision was made to renovate a unit in this school for the orthopedically handicapped students.

Under ordinary circumstances when handicapped children are moved to regular schools, workshops are provided for the faculties to alleviate concerns and to develop teachers' understanding about the population of students. However, since the training institute described in this paper had just been completed, the school system did not believe it was necessary to implement an additional workshop.

The knowledge and understanding the regular education teachers had obtained from visitations to the orthopedic unit during the training institute were of inestimable value to the students as well as to the faculty. The transition of this new program into Catherine T. Reed Elementary resulted in fewer frustrations than usual for administrators and faculty members, at the same time alleviating many adjustment problems that students might otherwise have experienced.

Further Applications

During the school year 1977-78, some phases of the training institute were repeated at monthly workshops for special and

regular education personnel throughout the area. The Inservice Committee for Special Education in the area which is under the supervision of the practicum participant plans and implements monthly inservice workshops. Teachers complete a questionnaire through which their interests and professional needs are assessed. From this information, a series of workshop sessions are presented. In response to teachers' expressions of interest, the practicum participant presented two components from the training institute package, from the module on techniques of classroom management and instruction for special education students.

As a result of information disseminated both by word of mouth and in News and Views, the County's public school newspaper (see Appendix J), special education teachers from three elementary schools and one junior high school stated in writing that a program like the practicum training institute was needed at those schools. In addition, four junior high school principals stated that an increase in special education staff was needed to provide adequate educational services to special students. Due to an overabundance of regular duties and responsibilities, the practicum participant and her staff considered it impossible to fulfill the requests for implementation of the training institute at individual schools. An attempt to combine schools to implement a single training institute for all met with non-acceptance.

The demand for the training institute and the inability to meet this demand were discussed with the Director of Special Education and at Special Education Supervisory Meetings. Concurrently, during the fall semester of 1977-78, the Maryland State Department of Education received funds from the Federal government which were designated for mainstreaming of handicapped students. A proposal was written in February of 1978 by the Director of Special Education requesting three professional positions to assist in mainstreaming for each of the three administrative areas in the County. These professionals were to train and assist regular education teachers to work with special education students. Their services were to be provided in the classroom as well as through inservice training.

As of July 1, 1978, two of the three positions requested for each area had been allocated. The two professionals to be selected for the practicum participants' area will utilize the training institute as a basis for development of inservice training programs. The other two administrative areas have also requested permission to use the training institute package.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY

This practicum effort provided an inservice training program for classroom teachers in an elementary school who were concerned about their ability to deal effectively with handicapped students. Prior to this time, these regular education teachers had never been exposed to any training related to teaching the handicapped, and they were consequently anxious and apprehensive about having the students in their classrooms.

In addition, management of the special education program in this school had been restructured to resource rooms, which resulted in mainstreaming of handicapped students. Some students were prevented from being mainstreamed for appropriate amounts of time in regular classrooms because of the teachers' feelings of unreadiness. Therefore, the training institute discussed in this paper provided a vehicle for teachers to develop skills through instructional units which dealt with diagnoses, programming, classroom management, teaching techniques, and accountability for special education. Teachers' gains in knowledge were evaluated through their performance of tasks which were in accordance with special education policies and procedures.

Students' gains were measured by an increase in their attendance in regular classrooms, when deemed appropriate. This

increase in the amount of time in the mainstream provided a more equal access to the total range of educational services in this school for the special education students.

After the practicum, the school climate appeared to be more favorable for handicapped students, as was evidenced by their fuller participation in all areas of the school setting. Regular teachers are now more receptive toward accepting these students in their classrooms, and both resource room and regular teachers improved their cooperative teaching skills, which resulted in a closer working relationship in the educational management of all students in the school.

It is believed that this practicum effort was very successful for teachers, students, administrators, consultants, and, above all, the practicum participant. She experienced an immeasurable degree of professional and personal gratification from having developed, implemented, and participated in this educational endeavor.

GLOSSARY

Handicapping Conditions

Severely Handicapped: Students whose multiple handicapping conditions (severe language deficits, and medical, social and pyschological problems, in varying combinations) critically impede their ability to learn. In relation to this paper, the Prince George's County School System takes the position that schooling for severely handicapped children should take place in a protective environment. Therefore, such students are assigned to special schools as opposed to regular public schools. Severely handicapped children were not involved in the practicum effort.

More Severely Handicapped: As used in this paper, this term refers to the 18 more severely handicapped students in the population of 45 "mildly handicapped" children in the elementary school involved in the practicum. Prior to the practicum effort, these 18 students had been believed to have intellectual limitations, and cognitive, sensory, and emotional disabilities, that precluded anything but minimal expectations for their achievement in regular academic classes. The 18 students had formerly been placed in special classes.

*Educable Mentally Retarded: Students with sub-average general intellectual functioning and deficits in adaptive behavior which adversely affect educational performance. These students are assigned to regular schools in Prince George's County.

*Specific Learning Disability: Students with disorders in one or more of the processes of speech, language, reading, writing, or arithmetic. These disorders may be caused by neurological or perceptual handicaps, or by brain injury, and may not be the result of mental retardation, or visual, hearing, or motor handicaps. These students are assigned to regular public schools in Prince George's County.

*Emotionally Impaired: Students exhibiting a condition over a period of time which affects educational performance and causes an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships, an inability to learn which cannot be explained by other handicapping conditions, inappropriate behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances, and other emotional and behavioral disturbances. These students are assigned to regular public schools in Prince George's County.

---

*These definitions are adapted from Maryland Program for Handicapped Children, Bylaw 13.04.01, Code of Bylaws of the Maryland State Board of Education, 1968.

School Settings

Comprehensive Schools (Regular Schools): Refers, in this paper, to regular elementary public schools which provide a range of educational services for students in grades K-6, including services for mildly handicapped students. Severely handicapped students are not treated in these schools.

Self-Contained Classrooms: Special classes consisting of the more severely handicapped of the "mildly handicapped" students in a public school setting. The term "more severely handicapped" has been defined above.

Resource Room: This term refers to a special education program with a special education teacher who provides supportive educational services to handicapped students (who attend regular classes based upon an appropriate period of time for each student) so they can be successfully maintained in the regular classrooms.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Booom, Arnold, The New York Education Department News. Albany, New York: Office of Public Information, 1973, pp. 2-4.

Brenton, Myron. "Mainstreaming of the Handicapped." Today's Education, The Journal of N.E.A 63 (March-April 1974): 20-25.

Davis, Larry N., and McCallon Earl. Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Workshops. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1974.

Deno, Evelyn. Instructional Alternatives for Exceptional Children. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

Dunn, Lloyd M. "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded--Is Much of It Justifiable?" Journal of Exceptional Children 35 (September 1968): 5-22.

Education U.S.A./Special Report. Educating All the Handicapped: What the Laws Say and What Schools Are Doing. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1977, pp. 5-96.

Guerin, Gilbert R. and Szatolcky, Kathleen. "Integration Programs for the Mildly Retarded." Exceptional Children 41 (November 1974): 173-179.

Harig, Norris G. and Krug, David A. "Placement in Regular Programs: Procedures and Results." Exceptional Children 41 (March 1975): 413-417.

Irvin, Tom. "Implementation of Public Law 94-142." Exceptional Children 43 (November 1976) : 135-137.

Lilly, Stephen M. "A Training Based Model for Special Education." Journal of Exceptional Children 37 (Summer 1971): 745-749.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962, pp. 44-57.

Maryland, Continuum Design for Handicapped Children . Maryland: State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, 1975.

Maryland Programs for Handicapped Children, Bylaw 13.04.01 Code of Bylaws of the Maryland State Board of Education. May 1968, pp. 1-2.

Massie, Dorothy. "Update on Special Education." Today's Education, Journal of the N.E.A. 63 (September-October 1978): 61.

National Education Association. Mainstreaming Infopac No. 9. Washington D. C. (August 1975): 1-14.

National Education Association Reporter. "Mainstreaming Discussed in Depth." September 1975, pp. 1-7 (reprint).

National School Public Relations Association, Educating All the Handicapped, What the Law Says, and What Schools are Doing. Arlington, Virginia: 1975.

Nyquist, Eward E. Mainstreaming: Idea and Actuality. Albany, New York, 1975.

Peck, Robert F. and Tucker, James A. "Research on Teacher Education. In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. by Robert M.W. Travers. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally and Co., 1973.

Project Accept. University of Kansas, Department of Education, n.d.

Project Accumen: Preparing Teachers to Educate Exceptional Children in Regular Class Settings. Department of Instruction, Division of Special Education. Raleigh, North Carolina: State Department of Education, 1975.

Reynolds, Maynard C. and Birch, Jack W. Teaching Exceptional Children in All America's Schools. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977, pp. 3-47.

Rose, Clare and Trent, James W. "Research on Higher Education," In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Ed. by Robert M.W.Travers, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973.

Scriven, Michael Evaluation, A Study Guide for Educational Administrators. Berkeley, California: University of California, 1974.

SELECT, Special Study Institute Series, Arizona Department of Education, Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped. Phoenix, Arizona: 1975.

Shotel, Jay R. et al. "Teacher Attitudes Associated with the Integration of Handicapped Children." Exceptional Children 38 (May 1972), pp. 667-683.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Proceedings of the Conference on Research Needs Related to the Development of of Personnel to Serve the Handicapped. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1975.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Programs for the Handicapped. Washington, D.C.: Office for Handicapped Individuals, July 1977, pp. 7 -10.

APPENDIX A

Prince George's County Public Schools

UPPER MARLBORO, MARYLAND 20870 • TELEPHONE 301 627-4800

CARL W. HASSEL, Superintendent of Schools

DR. ANNABELLE E. FERGUSON
Assistant Superintendent
Central Area Administrative Office
Hill Road and L Street
Landover, Maryland 20785

Telephone: (301) 336-6100

June 4, 1976

MEMORANDUM: JEM-76-85-SP.ED.

TO: Teachers at Catherine T. Reed

FROM: Jessie B. Mason, Supervisor of Special Education Central Area
Raymond S. Peters. Learning Problems Resource Specialist
Linda Swanson, Itinerant Resource Teacher
Task Force Members: Mary Bell, Lee Johnson, Roger White, Hazel Davis, Bernice Bloom, Ann Weismiller, Joanne Girardi, Frances Garrison

RE: Staff Development Workshop to Facilitate the Mainstreaming Process

As a follow-up to your concerns regarding special education students, your Task Force is planning a Staff Development Workshop for the purpose of facilitating the Mainstreaming process. Hopefully, this program will become a pilot project which, when complete, can be packaged and shared with other schools.

Tentative modules to be included in the workshop are: behavior modification, identification of special education students, teaching strategies in basic skills for students with special needs, interpretation of records and utilizing the team approach. We are hoping that course credit can be earned through participation in the workshop. Our plans are to begin this project next fall.

In order to concretize plans for the workshop, an indication of your intent and your preference of scheduling is needed. Please fill out the questionnaire and return it by June 11, to Mary Bell.

I plan to attend the mainstreaming workshop: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Perhaps

I would perfer the workshop be offered:
- 3 - 5 p.m. one afternoon per week
- 7 - 9 p.m. one evening per week
- 8 - 12 a.m. Saturday, semi monthly
- Other

Suggestions or comments: _____

Your Name _____
Grade Level _____

Approved: Marion Mears / JBM
Marion Mears, Principal, Catherine T. Reed

lfs

Prince George's County Public Schools

UPPER MARLBORO, MARYLAND 20870 • TELEPHONE 301 627-4800

CARL W. HASSEL, Superintendent of Schools

DR. ANNABELLE E. FERGUSON
Assistant Superintendent
Central Area Administrative Office
Hill Road and L Street
Landover, Maryland 20785

Telephone: (301) 336-6100

October 3, 1976

MEMORANDUM: JBM-76-38-SP.ED.

TO: Principal and Faculty at Catherine T. Reed Elementary

FROM: Jessie B. Mason JBM.

RE: Staff Development Workshop to Facilitate the Mainstreaming Process

This is a follow-up of the June 4, 1976 memorandum setting forth the special education training institute. On November 1, 1976, a Plan for In-Service Activity was submitted to the Office of Staff Development so that a 3 hour credit would be granted for the course. To obtain the number of hours required for each session, the time will be January 19, 1977 to April 27, 1977: Wednesdays 3 - 6 p.m.

To reemphasize, the training institute will include:

Educational Diagnosis of Exceptional Students
Characteristics of Exceptional Students
Special Education Programs and Services in Prince George's County
Evaluation and Accountability for Special Education

In order to finalize plans for the training institute, please complete the information below.

I plan to attend the institute for a 3 hour credit. (15 sessions) yes ☐ no ☐

I plan to attend some of the sessions. (without a 3 hour credit) yes ☐ no ☐

Suggestions or comments: _____

_____

_____

Your Name _____ Grade Level _____

Home Address _____

Home Phone Number _____

APPENDIX C

Teacher Survey Form

(Pre- and Post-test)

Directions: Please circle the number that best represents how you feel about the following statements.

	Positive		Neutral		Negative
	5	4	3	2	1
I am able to educationally diagnose handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
I can evaluate students' preferred learning modalities.	5	4	3	2	1
I am able to prepare an effective program for mildly handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1
I can adapt my classroom curriculum to the learning styles of children.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX D

Survey of Instructional Problems

(Pre- and Post-test)

Directions: Please indicate the degree to which each of the following is a problem for you. Place a check mark in the appropriate column.

Statement	Negligible	Moderate	Serious	Critical
Teachers are not consulted before handicapped children are placed in their classes.	___	___	___	___
Handicapped children are moved into regular classes without considering their special needs.	___	___	___	___
Regular students are adversely affected by mainstreaming.	___	___	___	___
Appropriate materials are not provided for teachers and the handicapped children.	___	___	___	___
Supporting services, particularly specialists, are not available to teachers.	___	___	___	___
Inservice education offered is of little value to my job.	___	___	___	___
Inservice education focuses on school system needs rather than on teacher needs.	___	___	___	___
Inservice education is too general to satisfy my special needs.	___	___	___	___
Inservice education is not planned cooperatively with teachers.	___	___	___	___

APPENDIX E

S *pecial*

T *raining*

for

E *ducational*

P *rogramming*

Jessie B. Mason
Supervisor Special Education Central Area
Coordinator

Institute: Identifying and Programming for Special Education

for

Faculty of Catherine T. Reed Elementary School
Marian Mears, Principal

January 19, 1977 - April 27, 1977

Wednesday, 3 to 6 p.m.

GOAL: To increase classroom teachers' knowledge of how to identify and program for students with learning problems.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To increase classroom teachers' knowledge of learning characteristics of students with special needs.

2. To increase classroom teachers' knowledge of programs and services available to students with special needs.

3. To increase classroom teachers' skills to develop educational management plans for students with special needs.

4. To increase classroom teachers' skills to develop educationally programming for students with special needs.

5. To increase classroom teachers' knowledge of the evaluation of students' with special needs, level of performance in terms of their expectancy level.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

CENTRAL AREA

Spring Semester
January 19, 1977 - April 27, 1977

In-Service Activity Schedule
Catherine T. Reed Elementary School

SPECIAL TRAINING FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING
(STEP)

Institute: Identifying and Programming for Special Education

January 19, 1977 - February 9, 1977

Registration and First Class Session — Jessie B. Mason

MODULE I - Identification of Students with Special Needs

Consultants: Peggy Snyder, School Psychologist, Northern Area
Frances Mowery, Learning Problems Resource Specialist,Central Area
Linda Swanson, Learning Problems Resource Specialist, Central Area
Ida Rogers, Assistant Supervisor of Guidance, Central Area

February 16, 1977 - March 9, 1977

MODULE II - Special Education Programs and Services in Prince George's County

Consultants: Jessie B. Mason
TBA*
Irene Paonessa, Learning Problems Resource Specialist Central Area
Yvonne Felton, EID Specialist, Central Area
Mina Banks, Acting Specialist for Speech, Central Area
Ron Gentry, Itinerant Motor Development Teacher, Central Area
Nancy White, Acting Specialist for Hearing, Central Area
Joan Daly, Coordinating Home Teacher, Central Area

March 16, 1977 - March 30, 1977

MODULE III - Techniques of Classroom Management

Consultants: Mary S. Schanberger,Ed.D., Director of Special Education
TBA*

April 6, 1977 - April 27, 1977

MODULE IV - Evaluation and Accountability for Students with Special Needs

Consultants: Jane Riggin, Administrative Assistant Special Education
Alice Lazar, Psychologist, Central Area
Raymond S. Peters, Learning Problems Resource Specialist Central Area
Sundra Petty, Resource Room Teacher, Central Area

* TBA: to be announced later.

OBSERVERS

Mrs. Frances R. Fuchs, Supervisor of Special Education, Southern Area, Prince George's County, Maryland

Mr. Lloyd Hoover, Coordinating Supervisor, Central Area, Prince George's County, Maryland

Mrs. Marion Mears, Principal, Catherine T. Reed Elementary School, Prince George's County, Maryland

Jessie B. Mason - Coordinator
Supervisor Special Education Central Area

SPECIAL EDUCATION

CENTRAL AREA

SPECIAL TRAINING FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING
(STEP)

Institute: Identifying and Programming for Special Education

Listing of Training Modules and Components

MODULE I - Identification of Students with Special Needs — January 19, 1977

- Component A. Characteristics of Specific Learning Disability (SLD) child
- Component B. Characteristics of Intellectually Limited Child
- Component C. Characteristics of Mildly Emotionally Impaired Child
- Component D. Learning Styles
- Component E. Assessment Techniques
- Component F. Records

MODULE II - Special Education Programs and Services in Prince George's County — February 16, 1977

- Component A. Mainstreaming
- Component B. Supportive Services Available in Prince George's County
- Component C. Wings and Diagnostic Centers
- Component D. Multiple Handicapped Center
- Component E. Emotionally Impaired Programs: Lincoln and North Forestville

MODULE III - Techniques of Classroom Management — March 16, 1977

- Component A. Behavioral Management
- Component B. Programming for Basic Skill Deficits
- Component C. Community Resources

MODULE IV - Evaluation and Accountability for Students with Special Needs — April 6, 1977

- Component A. Specific Behaviors
- Component B. Grading

Component C. Communication with Parents

Component D. Legal Requirements

Component E. A Continuum Model for Delivery of Services

SPECIAL TRAINING FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING

(STEP)

INSTITUTE: IDENTIFYING AND PROGRAMMING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

MODULE I - Identification of Students with Special Needs

Component A. Characteristics of Specific Learning Disability (SLD) child.

Competency 1. Demonstrate understanding of common definitions and terminology utilized in describing the SLD child.

2. Etiology of the SLD child.

3. Descriptions of the SLD child.

a. Learning

b. Behavioral

4. Academic Expectations of the SLD child.

Component B. Characteristics of Intellectually Limited Child

Competenc 1. Demonstrate understanding of common definition and terminology utilized in describing the intellectually limited child.

2. Etiology of the intellectually limited child.

3. Descriptions of the intellectually limited child.

a. Adaptive Behavior

b. Learning

c. Behavioral

4. Academic expectations of the intellectually limited child.

Component C. Characteristics of Mildly Emotionally Impaired Child

Competency 1. Demonstrate understanding of common definition and terminology utilized in describing the mildly emotionally impaired child.

2. Etiology of the mildly emotionally impaired child.

3. Descriptions of the mildly emotionally impaired child

    a. Learning

    b. Behavioral

4. Academic expectations of the mildly emotionally impaired child.

Component D. Learning Styles

Competency 1. Input, mediation, output model.

2. Learning Modalities

    a. Receptive and expressive speech

    b. Visual-motor perception

    c. Auditory discrimination

    d. Visual and auditory memory

3. Appropriate educational settings

    a. Regular schools

    b. Diagnostic Centers

    c. Wings

        1. Specific learning disabilities

        2. Emotionally impaired

    d. Mulitple Handicapped Centers

    e. Home Teaching

Component E. Assessment Techniques

Competency 1. Description and demonstration of tests used in formal psychological testing.

    a. Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised (WISC-R), Weschler Preschool-Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI), Stanford Binet, Bender Gestalt, Wepman, Draw-A-Man (Projective Tests)

2. Description and demonstration of special education administered tests.
    a. Slingerland, Slosson, Berry, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)
    b. Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)
    c. Others
3. Informal assessment techniques.
4. Demonstrate ability to adapt curriculum to the learning level of the student based on diagnostic information.

Component F. Records

Competency 1. Collect and interpret records of students as related to academic, social-emotional and adaptive behavior.

2. Explanation of special education forms and information necessary for record keeping.
    a. Record of parental contacts
    b. Referral to Pupil Services
    c. Referral for Special Education Services
    d. Special Services Information System (SSIS)
    e. Educational Management Plan (SEP-14) Part I and II
    f. Notice of Special Education Service
        1. Resource Room (SEP-3R) placement and withdrawal
        2. Self-contained (SEP-6) placement and withdrawal
    g. Record of teacher-pupil conferences
    h. Record of special education teacher and regular classroom teacher conferences.
    i. Other conferences relating to student.

MODULE II: Special Education Programs and Services in Prince George's County

Component A. Mainstreaming

Competency 1. Define Mainstreaming

a. See Handbook, p. 19

2. Explain function of the in-school team

3. Outline roles/functions of the resource teacher and other in-school staff.

a. Speech

b. Reading

4. Summarize options within the regular school.

a. Resource Room

b. Structured learning environment

c. And/or other school services

5. Summarize components in planning for mainstreaming and unit system.

a. Hours

b. A.M. vs P.M. programming

c. Coordination of regular classroom and resource room program.

d. Sharing of materials

Component B. Supportive services available in Prince George's County

Competency 1. Understanding problems and services available for:

a. Early Identification

b. Speech

c. Motor Development

d. Hearing Impaired

e. Visually Impaired

f. Physically Impaired

g. Home Teaching

Component C. Wings and Diagnostic Centers

Competency 1. Visitation: observation and description of students

a. Describe students in this setting

1. Justification according to state and county regulations

b. Describe procedures for obtaining placement for students

c. Describe state and county regulations relating to this handicapping condition

1. Class size

2. Personnel

Component D. Multiple Handicapped Center

Competency 1. Visitation: observation and description of students

a. Describe students in this setting

1. Justification according to state and county regulations

b. Describe procedures for obtaining placement for students

c. Describe state and county regulations relating to this handicapping condition

1. Class size

2. Personnel

Component E. Emotionally Impaired Programs: Lincoln and North Forestville

Competency 1. Visitation: observation and description of students

a. Describe students in this setting

1. Justification according to state and county regulations

b. Describe procedures for obtaining placement for students

c. Describe state and county regulations relating to this handicapping condition

1. Class size

2. Personnel

MODULE III: Techniques of Classroom Management

Component A. Behavioral Management

Competency 1. Identify target behavior and describe observable behavior

2. Match target behavior with appropriate strategies for management

a. Contingency contracting

b. Interest centers

c. Quiet corners

d. Group recognition

3. Develop alternative strategies and techniques for management

4. Dealing with peer pressures

5. Describe ways to initiate, implement and maintain desirable classroom environment

6. Free play activities as adjuncts to learning

Component B. Programming for Basic Skill Deficits

Competency 1. Strategies for teaching - learning reading skills

2. Strategies for teaching - learning math skills

3. Strategies for teaching - learning handwriting skills

a. Handwriting Dysfunction

4. Strategies for increasing social-emotional responses

a. Adaptive Behavior

Component C. Community Resources

Competency 1. Understanding of:

a. Social Services

b. Juvenile Services

c. Public Health Nurse (PHN)

d. Clinics

e. Mental Health Facilities

f. Private Domain

1. Schools

2. Medical - Neurological - Psychiatric

MODULE IV: Evaluation and Accountability for Students with Special Needs

Component A. Specific Behaviors

Competency 1. Goal setting for specific behaviors

2. Assessment of goal attainment

a. As related to behavioral management

b. As related to instruction

Component B. Grading

Competency 1. Cooperative Staff Efforts

a. As related to expected educational progress

b. As related to expected behavioral attainment

Component C. Communication with Parents

Competency 1. Relating appropriate behaviors

2. Elicit their support to eliminate inappropriate behavior

3. Optimal timing of contact with parents

Component D. Legal Requirements

Competency 1. Understanding of County regulations re:

a. Truancy

b. Suspensions

c. Child abuse

2. Understanding Federal and State Laws relating to education of the handicapped

a. Define due process, least restrictive alternative, continuum of services as they relate to programs for the handicapped

b. Interpret Federal and State legislation effecting Special Education programs

1. State by-law 13.04.01.01 in its various forms

2. Federal law 94-142

c. Describe the goals of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped: Child Find, zero reject, severe/profound

d. Sources of funding

e. Appeal procedures

1. As related to parents

2. As related to educational programming

Component E. A Continuum Model for Delivery of Services

Competency 1. Identify and describe services of agencies within Maryland that provide services for the handicapped, mild to profound

2. Describe procedures for obtaining placement for students in programs outside their local education agency

3. Analyze referral and evaluation procedures utilizing a continuum of professionals and support personnel services

4. Analyze programming which utilizes a continuum of professionals and support personnel services

5. Develop a model of services appropriate to meet the needs of students evidencing the full range of handicaps, mild to profound

APPENDIX F

Module Assessment Tasks for the STEP Program

Module I: Task

Using available records, select a child in your classroom and describe verification of handicapping conditions as discussed in Module I. Document why the child fits the description of specific learning disabled (SLD), intellectually limited, or emotionally impaired.

Module II: Task

To refine your observational techniques concerning the delivery of services to students at the observation site, describe:

a. Class size
b. Student/adult ratio
c. Physical plant
d. Motor and speech services
e. Use of supportive services

Module III: Task

Based on the information you have gained, submit an educational management plan for a student of your choosing.

Module IV: Task

What would you consider as your primary job target as it relates to accountability and evaluation for students with special needs? Include to what legal requirement you relate this accountability.

APPENDIX G

PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

NAME _____ DATE _____

INSTITUTE: _____

1. Objectives

   a. Are institute objectives clear? _____
   b. Do they meet your needs? _____
   c. Suggested improvements _____

2. Materials

   a. Are materials easy to understand? _____
   b. Are they meeting your needs? _____
   c. Suggested improvements _____

3. Consultants

   a. Are consultants and resource people addressing your concerns? _____
   b. List any who are not. _____
   c. Suggested improvements _____

4. Structure

   a. Are group size and composition helpful to learning? _____
   b. Physical arrangements for group work appropriate? _____
   c. Suggested improvements _____

5. Aids

   a. Are learning aids appropriate? _____
   b. Supplies adequate? _____
   c. Suggested improvements _____

6. Facility

   a. Problems _____

PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

b. Suggested improvements _____

_____

_____

7. Future Needs

a. Have you discovered additional learning needs? _____
b. What? _____

_____

_____

8. Time

a. Is pace of learning activities appropriate? _____
b. Suggested improvements _____

_____

_____

9. Methods

a. Which type of learning activities worked best? _____
b. Which encountered problems? _____

_____

c. Suggestions _____

_____

_____

10. Energy/Attention

a. Are more/fewer breaks needed? _____
b. Was your energy or attention lower at certain times? _____
c. When? _____

_____

e. Why? _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX H

EVALUATION FORM FOR CONSULTANTS

NAME OF CONSULTANT _____

DATE OF SESSION _____ NAME OF MODULE _____

COMPONENT _____

Please write a brief description of what occured in your session(s) as soon as possible after it. This will help clarify what happened as you see it. It will also help to assess the session(s) and arrange for necessary improvements, if needed. Summarize your view of what was discussed, how the participants reacted to the activities, and what your major objectives were in your role as consultant. Return this summary to Jessie B. Mason, after the session(s). Thank you.

1. Describe the atmosphere of this session. (physical surroundings, number of students present, degree of teacher participation, etc.):

2. Describe the topic(s) discussed (to what extent were the topics explored or discussed? On what points do you think the participants gained more understanding? What topics were not discussed that you hoped would be discussed? etc.)

3. Describe your role (what did you do, or learn you could do with the group, that made you feel satisfied? What did you wish you had not done? How would have done it differently? How would you want to improve the next time you did this?)

APPENDIX I

Plan for Inservice Activity

Submitted to the school system's Office of Staff Development.

State Specific Objectives

This project proposes to train regular classroom teachers at Catherine T. Reed Elementary School to work more effectively with the mildly handicapped student in the regular classroom situation. The major specific objectives are:

1. To improve regular classroom teachers' knowledge of the learning characteristics of the handicapped student with specific learning disability, intellectual limitations, and emotional impairment.

2. To improve the participants' growth in diagnosing and prescribing an academic program for mildly handicapped children.

3. To increase teaching competencies of regular teachers so that educational needs of mildly handicapped children can be met with a higher degree of success in regular classroom settings.

4. To increase participants' knowledge of special education services in the Prince George's County Public School System.

5. To improve participants' knowledge of the mainstreaming concept and the resource concept.

List Tentative Schedule of Events

Dates of Workshop:	January 19, 1977 to April 27, 1977
Time of Workshop:	3 to 6 p.m. weekly on Wednesdays
Module I:	January 19 to February 9, 1977
Module II:	February 16 to March 9, 1977
Module III:	March 16 to April 13, 1977
Module IV:	April 20 to April 27, 1977

Briefly Describe Content

This inservice plan will be organized as an institute comprised of four modules, components in each module, and competencies under each component. The institute series will be entitled Identifying and Programming for Handicapped Students. The four

Plan for Inservice Activity (cont'd)

modules are:

Module I	Identification of Handicapped Children
Module II	Special Education Programs and Services in Prince George's County
Module III	Techniques for Teaching the Special Child in the Classroom
Module IV	Evaluation and Accountability for the Special Child

In each module the number of components varies from two to five; the compentencies teachers are expected to master are delineated in the plan, below.

Describe Types of Experiences to Be Provided for Participants (including out-of-class activities)

Strategies for presentation of modules will be facilitated by the use of lectures, discussions, demonstrations, slides, videotapes, movies. Each teacher will receive information on the learning characteristics of handicapped students. Each teacher will receive training and practice in administering and interpreting formal and informal diagnostic tools for children with specific learning disabilities. Each teacher will write an educational management plan based on the diagnostic result of the test administered. Overview of available services for the handicapped in Prince George's County School System will be presented. Development of teacher-made materials will be encouraged. Design objectives will be based upon student's needs. Each faculty member will make an on-site visit to observe other special education services in Prince George's County. (The visitations will be facilitated by parent-substitute teams.) In-class observations and follow-up advisement will pertain.

State Methods of Evaluating Particpants' Attainment of Objectives

1. On-site review group of three educators, i.e., principal, supervisor, and teacher.

2. Weekly questionnaires for participants to determine effectiveness of each session.

3. Locally prepared materials and checklists to assess each component.

4. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory: Pre- and Post-test.

5. Achievement Tests.

Prince George's County Public Schools, Upper Marlboro, Md. 20870

NEWS & VIEWS

News & Views is published weekly.
Send correspondence to the Publications Office,
Upper Marlboro. Albert Shanker M. Spencer

Dr. Edward J. Hanson, Superintendent

May 31, 1977
Issue 3-48

Mainstreaming - Why Not?

At Catherine T. Reed Elem., 11 classroom teachers, two resource room teachers, the reading teacher, and the vice principal have been involved in a Special Training for Educational Programming Institute (STEP) coordinated by Jose B. Mason, Central Area Special Ed. Supervisor.

The institute was developed with and for the teachers who felt the need for learning more about meeting the needs of children with special learning disabilities for the process of mainstreaming.

A group of teachers and the supervisor encompassed a task force who met regularly to plan a full program covering as many aspects as the teachers felt necessary to make them better prepared in working with the learning disabled child.

The participants will receive a three-hr. credit from the State Department of Education.

The Md. State Dept. of Ed., Div. of Vocational, T & Ed., Associated Builders and Contractors, and the Adult Continuing Ed. Program will cooperatively sponsor an in-service training session for Adult-Apprenticeship-Related Instruction teachers.

The session will be held at Eleanor Roosevelt Sr., Thurs., June 23, and Tues., June 28, from 7 to 10 p.m. Apprenticeship related instruction teachers who are not employed in state-sponsored programs may participate on a first-come first-served basis. Phone 952-4371.

USE OF BICYCLES

Even though bicycle repair and bicycle safety have been included as part of the curriculum, the actual riding of bicycles is not part of the instructional program. For this reason, bikes are not included as part of the instructional equipment, either for regular school programs or special ed. programs.

If schools have acquired bicycles as equipment, from any source, principals are to complete Material Transfer/Reports of Excess Property forms and send to Dr. Shockley's office in Upper Marlboro. Arrangements will then be made to have the bicycles picked up.

FREE COURSE ON PARENTHOOD

Pr. Geo.'s Chapter of the Red Cross is offering a free course, Preparation for Parenthood, which teaches expectant parents the practical aspects of childbirth and infant care. The 12-hr course, taught by Red Cross volunteer nurses, begins on the 1st week of every month in the training rooms of the Hecht Co. at Pr. Geo.'s Plaza, Marlow Heights, Landover Mall, and at Woodward & Lothrop's at Pr. Geo.'s Plaza. Enrollment is limited to 15.

If you are an expectant or adoptive mother or father, grandparent or student nurse, or simply interested in learning about pregnancy and infant care, call the Red Cross at 559-4500, M-F, 9 to 4:30 p.m. for more info.

SCHEDULED WORK DAYS FOR CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL

A number of calls have been received in the Classified Personnel Office relative to work days for classified personnel. This matter is covered in detail in Superintendent of Schools' Bulletin 8-13-77 of Aug. 13, 1976, relative to Scheduled Work Days for classified personnel. If you have further questions please call the Classified Pers. Off. 952-4710.

SEMINAR ON DEPRESSION

The public is invited to attend a free seminar on depression at Pr. Geo.'s Gen. Hospital & Med. Ctr., Wed., June 1, from 7:30 to 9:30 p.m.

Area psychiatrists and psychologists will talk on the various aspects of depression. The seminar is a joint effort of the Mental Health Assoc. of Pr. Geo.'s and the hospital. For more info, call 341-3358.

MARLBOROUGH DAY

Saturday, June 4 will be a great day to spend in Upper Marlboro. In connection with the formal dedication of Pr. Geo.'s new County Administration Bldg., all-day festivities will be held along Main Street.

At least 10 local music groups will perform, starting at 10 a.m. and continuing till 5 p.m. From rock to gospel music---music for all tastes will be featured. Local craftsmen will demonstrate and sell their wares---pottery, wood sculpture, ceramics, weaving, metalsmithing, dried flower arrangements, leathercraft; etc. Local artists, both pro and amateur, will display and offer paintings and sculpture for sale.

Formal dedication ceremonies will be held at the new Admin. Bldg. at noon, and open house will be held from 12:30 to 3 p.m. Free parking will be available behind the Courthouse and at Marlboro Racetrack.

The event is being sponsored by the Citizens Working for a New Quality Committee, the Marlboro Recreation Council, the Arts Division of the Md.-Nat'l Cap. Park and Planning Com., and Dimensions in Music. For more info, contact the Arts Div. at 277-2200 or the Public Affairs Office at 952-4723.

WILLIAM S. GRAY MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP

Applications are now being received for the William S. Gray Memorial Scholarship, established in memory of the former Coordinating Supervisor of Instruction for the Central Area.

The $500 scholarship is awarded each Sept. for matriculation at Bowie State College. Recipients must be Md. state residents, first year college students, enrolled in education, and deserving of the award, as determined by Bowie State's Admin. Office in collaboration with the Student Government. Interested parties should contact David Swift, Director of Development, Bowie State College; phone 262-7330.

position opening

Classified

Pr. Geo.'s Co. Four positions: (1) *Cafeteria Mgr.* Vacancies anticipated at the following schools: for Classified Scale Grade 9: Bradbury Heights Elem., Carmody Hills Elem., John H. Howard Elem., Kettering Jr., and Middleton Valley Elem.; for Grade 11: Kenilend Elem., Owen Hill Jr., Ritchie Elem., Grade 14: DuVal Sr. (2) *Supply Expediter*, Grade 17. For both positions, deadline June 1. (3) *Sheetmetal & Roofing Repairman I* (Gr. 13); (4) *Electronics Technician II* (Gr. 18). Deadline June 6. For all positions obtain Application for Employment from Classified Pers. Off. in Upper Marlboro.

Professional

● Bd. of Ed., Frederick Co. Admin. Asst. for Community and Staff Relations. Deadline, June 17. Send letter of application, resume and samples of related work to Mr. T. Wanda Falcon, Asst. to the Supt. for Community and Staff Relations, Bd. of Ed., 115 E. Church St., Frederick, Md. 21701.

● Carroll Co. Public Schools. Elem. Asst. Principal. Deadline extended to June 17. Send all vita to Mr. John C. Graybeal, Dir. of Personnel, Carroll County Public Schools, Box 300, Westminster, Md. 21157.

● U. of Md. Two positions: (1) Clinical Supervisor in Audiology, and (2) Clinical Supervisor in Language/Speech Pathology. Both 10 months. Send vita and letters of reference to Nicholas W. Bankson, Ph.D., Acting Chm., Dept. of Hearing and Speech Sciences, U. of Md., College Park, Md. 20742. Deadline, June 1.

Do you need copies of the 1976-78 Annual Report? The Office of Information Services has extra copies. Please call 952-4350 and you will be sent as many as you wish.